

Paul Peck is truly right. Public service, and we all serve the President in that regard, is essential for our country's survival and prosperity.

Last year, Mr. Peck encouraged us all to think about change and improvements—about ways to make our service to the Presidency and through the Presidency to all of the people more effective and more valuable.

Tonight, I want to talk about two aspects of that service and provide you some thoughts on improvement.

I do so in the certain knowledge that the Civil Service, the military service and the Foreign Service of the United States have made numerous sacrifices and provided enormous opportunities for us all as citizens. We are lucky that for the size of our population, we have one of the smallest public services in numbers, both at the Federal and State level, when we compare it with other countries around the world.

Also, I see it as one which is generally dedicated, intelligent and hard-working. Indeed, our public found out how essential was our public service when just a few years ago in a budget battle, there were selective shutdowns of activities of the Federal Service and the public uproar was immediate, vigorous and sustained.

However, I must tell you I am troubled by the fact that in our presidential elections there has been an increasing tendency for presidential candidates to run against our public service. It's not just the talk of "clean up the mess in Washington", but that plays a role in it. There have been implications that the public service hasn't been faithful or it has been lazy and self-indulgent, or that it has not met the needs of the people. And the candidate of course will not only throw out the rascals from the opposing party, but go down to Washington and clean up "that mess" for once and for all.

This has hurt the reputation of our career public servants and I am concerned that in another oncoming electoral season, we will see much of the same rhetoric repeated. I hope I am wrong. I will keep my fingers crossed. But on the very off-chance that any candidates are listening tonight, I ask them to consider this issue carefully.

Secondly, I am concerned by the increasing, what I can only call, politicization of our Civil and Foreign Service.

We all know that over the years, Congressional legislation has sought to draw a clear bright line between public service and the elected political leadership. Indeed, that is as it should be.

As a public servant, I have understood the necessity for loyalty to the President and his policies. That too is as it should be. Our system has always provided a remedy if there was conflict or confusion—resignation.

But let me mention that during recent administrations, in the department that I know best, the Department of State, there has been a general replacement in jobs, some well down in the bureaucracy, of career appointments with political appointments.

Let me also note that the plumb book which lists these jobs has grown several fold over the last two decades, yet again another indication of the pressure of politics on the public service.

And then, let me mention something that I perhaps know even more about—Ambassadors.

As an Ambassador who served coming from the Career Service, I appreciate what my colleagues from outside the Career Service have often brought to the job. There have been, and continue to be, outstanding appointments to those jobs. Stu Eizenstat and Howard Baker, and might I add Nancy Kassebaum Baker in Japan, and Felix Rohatyn in France are but a few fine examples, and

there are many others—Max Kampelman and Sol Linowitz among others.

What disturbs me is the large number of such appointments for whom one cannot say they bring special knowledge, background, experience or wisdom to the job. We must be frank that they are there because they are being rewarded in the main for their financial contributions to the winning political party. At a time of war on terrorism that should not be the standard for such service!

The spoils system went out in the 1880s, but this remnant is not one that speaks well of our Presidency or indeed of our needs at a time when we are the undoubted leader of the world community in such a war.

One wag has remarked that the first job that was truly professionalized by popular acclaim was brain surgery. And after disastrous experiences in the Civil and Spanish-American war, we professionalized our Military Officer Corps.

Right now, by tradition more than anything else, about 70% of our Ambassadors are from the Career Service and 30% from the outside. Not too long ago, a distinguished American senator, who has gone on to serve at a high post in the Executive Branch, led the fight for reducing that number to 10%. He was unsuccessful, but I don't believe the project should be abandoned.

Where knowledge, experience and good training can make a difference, America deserves the best. The Career Service is organized to do that, and I would hope that this important improvement, in what I believe is the spirit of Paul Peck's Award, can be picked up and implemented in the future, despite my full understanding of all the difficulties in doing so. And I say that in full knowledge of the fact that the Career Service needs to send its best men and women to this assignment.

For me and for all of my colleagues in the Foreign Service and with all of those with whom I worked in the Civil and Military Service, it was and is always a privilege to serve this country.

Every day was a day of new challenges and new opportunities. I used to tell my staff that the day in which you did not learn something new and important in the service of our country as a day wasted.

You all, as Americans, gave us that opportunity. If I was able to give something back to you in return, then it was for me both a great pleasure and the highest honor.

Thank you most sincerely for your recognition tonight. Because you recognize public service as well as individuals at this occasion, I am pleased as well to tell you that my acceptance of this honor must be on behalf of all of those who have so loyally and faithfully served our country down through the generations.

Thank you very much.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

TRIBUTE TO SPEC JOSHUA L. KNOWLES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to SPEC Joshua L. Knowles of Sheffield, IA who courageously gave his life for his country in Operation Iraqi Freedom. He is the 10th Iowan to be killed since the start of hostilities in Iraq. My deepest sympathy goes out to his parents, Sandy and Les, and his two sisters, Breanna and Michelle, as they deal with their loss. SPEC Joshua Knowles graduated from Sheffield-Chapin/Meservey-Thornton High School in 1999 where he played football. He enlisted in the Iowa National Guard 1133rd Transportation

Company out of Mason City, IA, on February 18, 1999 and served as a motor transport operator. Specialist Knowles was killed on Thursday, February 5, 2004, when the cab of the military cargo truck he was riding in was hit by mortar fire as the convoy passed through Checkpoint 6 at the Baghdad International Airport. He was in the cab with fellow Iowan, SPEC Peter Bieber of Nora Springs, who was also injured in the attack. Specialist Knowles will be honored posthumously for his patriotic service to his country with the Purple Heart as well as the Bronze Star, which is awarded for members of the military who distinguish themselves "by heroic or meritorious achievement or service while engaged in an action against an enemy of the United States". In a press statement, Specialist Knowles' family recalled a shirt that he had sent them from Iraq. The shirt says, "U.S. Soldiers Never Die, They Just Take Cover Until the Next Mission" which they said exemplified his attitude toward military service. We can all be proud of this exceptional Iowan and I know he will be greatly missed by all those who knew him. In giving the ultimate sacrifice for his country, Specialist Knowles showed himself to be a true hero and patriot. I again want to express my sympathy for his family and my gratitude for his courageous service.

CBO COST ESTIMATE ON S. 1072

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office to accompany Senate Report 108-222, the committee report to S. 1072, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act, be printed in the RECORD. The estimate was not available when the report was filed by the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE
S. 1072—*Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2003*

Summary: Assuming appropriation action consistent with the funding levels specified in the bill, and assuming the appropriation of amounts necessary to complete highway and environmental studies and regulations required by the bill, CBO estimates that implementing S. 1072 would cost \$172 billion over the 2004-2009 period and about \$48 billion after 2009.

CBO estimates that enacting S. 1072 would reduce direct spending by about \$1.7 billion over the 2004-2009 period and by about \$3.4 billion over the 2004-2013 period. Finally, the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) estimates that enacting S. 1072 would reduce revenue collections by \$52 million over the 2004-2009 period and by \$130 million over the 2004-2013 period.

S. 1072 would extend the authority for the Federal-Aid Highway program. For this program, the bill would provide about \$218 billion of contract authority over the 2004-2009